IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.ESWARAIAH

WRIT PETITION NO : 23466 of 2005

Between:

Smt. T.Pushpaveni, W/o.T.Pratap Reddy,
R/o.3-4-529/3, Narayanaguda, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1. The District Collector, RR.District.
2. The Mandal Revenue Officer, Hayatnagar Mandal,

Rangareddy District.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Hyderabad East,

Goshamahal, Hyderabad.
4. Shri Yella Krishna Reddy, S/o.Late Satti Reddy,
   R/o.Abdullapurmet, Abdullapur Village, Hayatnagar Mandal,

Ranga Reddy District.

.....RESPONDENTS

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The writ petition is filed questioning the action of the respondents 1 to 3 in making the entry of the name of the 4th respondent in column No.13 of Pahanai in respect of Survey No.239 and 240 situated at Abdullahpuramet village, Hayatnagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

The case of the petitioner is that she is the owner of the land admeasuring Ac.5.20guntas in Survey No.239 and 240 situated at Abdullahpumet village, Hayatnagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District and she never sold, transferred or assigned the said land in favour of any body, much less, in favour of the 4th respondent. But, without there being any transfer of property by the petitioner, the name of the 4th respondent has entered in the phani as owner and possessor of the land in question in column No.13. After coming to know the said fact, the petitioner made a representation dated 13.04.2005 to the 2nd respondent-Mandal Revenue Officer, Hayatnagar Mandal as well as to the 3rd respondent-Revenue Divisional Officer, Hyderabad East, but no action has been taken by them. Hence, the writ petition.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Revenue.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the opinion that if there is any dispute with regard to the entries made in the revenue records, it is open for the petitioner to make a representation before the Mandal Revenue Officer to rectify the same within a period of one year under Section 3 of the Records of Rights Act, or elsewhere, it is always left open for the petitioner to file an appeal before the Revenue Divisional Officer under Section 5(5) of the Records of Rights Act.

Admittedly, the petitioner has already been made an application on 13.04.2005 to the respondents 2 and 3 which is pending before them.

In that view of the matter, without going into the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to direct the 3rd respondent-Revenue Divisional Officer, Hyderabad East to consider and dispose of the application dated 13.04.2005 made by the petitioner, after affording a reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as well as to the 4th respondent in accordance with law, within a

period of eight (8) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, if the said representation is not already disposed of.

With the above observation, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

_____

(V. ESWARAIAH, J)

Date: 14.11.2005

Ksn